



MEETING MINUTES
CENTRAL WATERFRONT PROCESS SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING
APRIL 20, 2010
3:30 – 5:00PM SMT 4050

Attendees

Gary Glant
Patrick Gordon
Mary Johnston
Cary Moon
John Nesholm
Mark Reddington
Brian Steinburg
Heather Trim
Ron Turner
Tod Vogel

Maggie Walker
Martha Wyckoff

Staff

Bob Chandler
Marshall Foster
David Goldberg
David Graves
Steve Pearce
Nathan Torgelson

Introduction:

Patrick Gordon - Overview of last meeting, RFQ process, hybrid process and other option,

Bob Chandler - Discussed consultant selection options; Option1) one RFQ for full team to complete services from framework plan through construction management. Option 2) would issue 2 RFQs. First for lead designer selected by beginning of August, and then engineering management team selection. Lead designer serves on selection committee for technical team. Together they'd form one team.

Mary Johnston - Clarification about hybrid and option #2

Patrick Gordon - Trying to get lead designer; then get perfect technical team

Mary Johnston - What happens if the firm can do both

Bob Chandler – Can only be one or the other; consultants need to determine which team they want to be on

RT – You shouldn't hire a lead designer, you should hire a planner; act as a consultant to the committee; I don't know if we know; not a designer role, but a planning role; in my opinion I think we are going after a planner – not a designer; we need a consultant to the client

Maggie Walker – What we're responding to is the seawall project and you need the full team on to enable that;

Bob Chandler – The Framework Plan has a large component of space allocation; millions of utilities; where are you going to put these utilities

Marshall Foster – Full design team also needed for the conceptual design

Ron Turner – Need a designer at multi-levels; I am arguing at myself; need design capacity

Patrick Gordon - Need to maximize window by October; what is the best team of putting the team together?

Bob Chandler - For Carey (review)

JN – Experience with big teams; majority of money is spend on infrastructure – need a strong designer and strong infrastructure team

Brian Steinburg – Is there a way in the process that once the lead designer is selected – they can be informed (they will)

Bob Chandler – Lead designer would be part of selection

Comment from outside committee (Dennis) – Integrated design team will help with your schedule; teams have already been planning this for over a year; advertise for an integrated design firm is the best;

Patrick Gordon - Balance shift; option #2 has a

Julie Parrot (audience) – concern about 2nd process – seawall team; lose

Mary Johnston - Where do we draw the line between the design part and technical part?

Cary Moon – Their ability to deliver; define selection criteria and then put teams together based on that evaluative criterion

Bob Chandler – We are evaluating options #1 vs. #2

Ron Turner – Flaw in the system for leaving out seawall from this contract; look at modifying the schedule to take care of political interest

Chris Rogers– What about a hybrid B where consultant and City hire subs together?

David Goldberg – Describe UW's method and how they treated the sub selection as the role of the designer. The contractual obligation fell to them, not the UW.

Maggie Walker – Legal parameters that the City needs to go through that private firms do not

Patrick Gordon - what are the pros/cons of these options?

John Nesholm – Project manager; much more linear vs. design process

Bob Chandler - We did it that way

Mary Johnston - Feel like there is going to be disappointment

Maggie Walker – Project Manager role what does it mean?

Bob Chandler - The Project Manager is really the team project manager who is ultimately responsible for delivering the project – including major civil and utility work. City will manage the project – don't need an owners representative.

Heather Trim – Can the design team propose to be the PM?

Bob Chandler – No, the RFQ needs to clearly state what we're selecting for.

Chris Rogers – Advocate for Option #2

John Nesholm – Not a match made in heaven; structural engineers know that they're often on teams because of when someone called them.

Maggie Walker – Integrated design means people

Patrick Gordon - If we go with option #1 – groups have ability to raise dysfunctions;

Marshall Foster – We will try and find a combination of both

Chris Rogers – The evaluation criteria should require that the team members need to work well with others - based on projects.

Bob Chandler – We need to know does this group work well in this environment; design and working in teams; we'll fully check references.

Chris Rogers – Going to their office to see them in their own environment is good – could City get a sponsor to fund trip to see how they treat their peers?

Brian Steinburg – Need a discussion once group is together to see if there is more consultants that need to be involved

Ron Turner – Measure by performance issues

Chris Rogers – Make sure you choose someone who you can work with for multiple years

Ron Turner – Can you clarify the consultants that you want on the inside and on the outside?

Martha Wyckoff – Option #2 is my favorite; RFQ will include lead designer input (NO)

Patrick Gordon - Writing of RFQ is important

Ron Turner – If you have a full team come in it will be beneficial

Patrick Gordon - Valid comment

Chris Rogers –Need to have a well written RFQ;

Cary Moon – When do we go quiet; I am getting calls from interested firms; The Stranger doing a waterfront article

John Nesholm – Would like to refer people to someone

Bob Chandler – Anyone who participates in RFQ then you're not going to eligible for design work

David – Send examples of RFQs if you'd like. You will not be able to review and edit the draft RFQ – that would make it public.

Mary Johnston – Option #2 process . How did it work for the Sculpture Park?

Chris Rogers – There was no pre-selection of subconsultants; client and lead designer chose consultants

Bob Chandler - Very different process; corporate city decision; so much money that people will come after us; complex world, bigger scale